UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,877	06/25/2003	Fred R. Wolf	1437P	5242

23699 7590 10/23/2006

CLAUSEN MILLER, P.C
SUITE 1600
10S. LASALLE STREET
CHICAGO, IL 60603

EXAMINER	
AHMED, HASAN SYED	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1615	

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/606,877	WOLF ET AL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hasan S. Ahmed	1615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 September 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *3-11,17-19,22-26 and 30-32* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,12-16,20,21 and 27-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *See Continuation Sheet*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :9/25/03,10/27/03,6/3/05,4/27/06.

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt is acknowledged of applicants': (a) Information Disclosure Statements filed on 25 September 2003, 27 October 2003, 3 June 2005, and 27 April 2006; (b) Response to Office Action (Restriction Requirement) filed on 1 September 2006; and (c) Power of Attorney filed on 28 September 2006.

* * * * *

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Groups V (claims 12 and 13) and VI (claims 14-16 and 27-29) in the reply filed on 1 September 2006 is acknowledged. Rejoinder of Groups V and VI is acknowledged.

Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 14-16, 20, 21, and 27-29 are currently pending.

* * * * *

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saunders, et. al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,977,269).

Saunders, et. al. teach a method for improving animal tissue quality (see col. 3, lines 18-21).

Saunders, et. al. disclose a method of improving the tissue quality of an animal – including the ruminant cattle of instant claims 12 and 13 (*see* col. 1, line 58) – by feeding the animal vitamin E (*see* col. 1, lines 41-43).

Although Saunders, et. al. do not explicitly recite the tocotrienols of instant claims 1 and 20, vitamin E and tocotrienols are known to be functional equivalents in the art (*see* Eenennaam, et. al.; paragraph 0004).

Saunders, et. al. further disclose improved color and reduced purge as measures of meat quality, as recited in instant claims 2 and 21 (*see* col. 1, lines 46-51).

While Saunders, et. al. do not explicitly teach all the instant claimed concentration of tocotrienols, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine suitable concentration through routine or manipulative experimentation to obtain the best possible results, as these are variable parameters attainable within the art.

Moreover, generally, differences in concentration will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456; 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Applicants have not demonstrated any unexpected or unusual results, which accrue from the instant concentration.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use tocotrienols as a method of improving cattle meat quality, as

taught by Saunders, et. al. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to add tocotrienols to an animal feed for the beneficial effects of improved meat quality, as explained by Saunders, et. al.

2. Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 14-16, 20, 21, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saunders, et. al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,977,269) in view of Eenennaam, et. al. (U.S. 2003/0154513).

Saunders, et. al. disclose a method of improving the tissue quality of an animal (*see* above).

The Saunders, et. al. reference differs from the instant application in that it does not disclose:

- the tocotrienols comprising a cereal grain crop genetically modified to have elevated mixed tocotrienol levels, as recited in instant claims 14, and 27;
- the corn of instant claims 15 and 28; and
- the oil of instant claims 16 and 29.

Eenennaam, et. al. teach transgenic plants modified to express polypeptides of the tocopherol biosynthesis pathway (*see* abstract).

The disclosure recites transgenic plants modified to have elevated mixed tocotrienol levels (*see* paragraphs 217-220). The plant may be the cereal grain crop corn of instant claims 14, 15, 27, and 28 (*see* paragraph 211).

The Eenennaam, et. al. reference teaches an animal diet comprising mixed tocotrienols comprising oil from a plant that has been genetically modified to have elevated mixed tocotrienol levels, as recited in instant claims 16 and 29.

While Eenennaam, et. al. do not explicitly teach all the instant claimed concentration of tocotrienols, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine suitable concentration through routine or manipulative experimentation to obtain the best possible results, as these are variable parameters attainable within the art.

Moreover, generally, differences in concentration will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456; 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Applicants have not demonstrated any unexpected or unusual results, which accrue from the instant concentration.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use tocotrienols as a method of improving cattle meat quality, as taught by Saunders, et. al. in view of Eenennaam, et. al. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to add tocotrienols to an animal feed for the beneficial effects of improved meat quality, as explained by Saunders, et. al.

* * * * *

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory

obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 14-16, 20, 21, and 27-29 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-38 of U.S. Patent No. 6,977,269 ('269). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because '269 claims a method of improving the tissue quality of an animal, including ruminant animals, using a tocopherol. *See* claims 1 and 8.

* * * * *

Provisional Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejections

1. Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 14-16, 20, 21, and 27-29 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-38 of copending Application No. 11/153,462 ('462). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because '462

claims a method of improving the tissue quality of an animal, including cattle, using a tocopherol. *See* claims 1 and 8.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

2. Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 14-16, 20, 21, and 27-29 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-27 of copending Application No. 11/153,463 ('463). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because '463 claims a method of improving the tissue quality of an animal, including ruminant animals, using mixed tocotrienols. *See* claims 1, 12, and 19.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 14-16, 20, 21, and 27-29 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 11/530,075 ('075). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because '075 claims a method of improving the tissue quality of an animal, including ruminant animals, using mixed tocotrienols. *See* claims 1, 10, and 13.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

☆

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hasan S. Ahmed whose telephone number is 571-272-4792. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael P. Woodward can be reached on 571-272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

***

MICHAEL P. WOODWARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600